

Chapter 11.0

Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

The following are unavoidable significant adverse impacts which remain after the implementation of the mitigation measures:

4.5 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

In the cumulative analysis (Year 2020) without the General Plan Circulation Element improvements, the roadway segments, except Couser Canyon to the project access, in the a.m. and p.m. peak would operate at LOS E or F. Couser Canyon to the project access would operate at LOS D in the a.m. peak and LOS E in the P.M. peak. Therefore, the project would contribute to a cumulatively significant impact on SR 76. Implementation of the mitigation measure to make an irrevocable offer of dedication for right-of-way, including a designated bike lane, and provision of fair share contribution could constitute fair share contribution. However, because of the uncertainty of the implementation of future improvements to SR 76 between I-15 and the western boundary of the project site, the cumulative traffic impact is considered significant and unmitigable.

4.6 NOISE AND VIBRATION

A cluster of residences along SR 76 between I-15 and Rice Canyon Road is currently located within the 60 CNEL contour. Project-generated traffic would adversely impact these residences since project generated traffic would increase the noise levels in an existing degraded noise environment. While a sound wall would mitigate the project's increase in noise to a level of insignificance, because implementation of the mitigation measure is not feasible (i.e., the wall would be installed on property not owned by the applicant and it is not known if the residents desire the wall), the impact is considered significant and unmitigable.

In addition, project-generated traffic when added to future cumulative traffic, would contribute to significant cumulative adverse noise impacts at the existing cluster of residences between I-15 and Rice Canyon Road and one additional residence on the north side of SR 76 just west of the project site. Again, while a sound wall could mitigate the project's contribution to traffic noise, the installation of a wall is not feasible since the wall would have to be installed on property not owned by the applicant and it is not known if the residents would object to the wall, so the installation of a wall is considered infeasible. Therefore, the project would have a significant and unmitigable project level traffic noise impact as well as contributing to a cumulatively significant and unmitigable traffic noise impact to residences along SR 76 between I-15 and the project site.

4.7 AIR QUALITY

The project would result in a project-related and cumulative unavoidable significant impact from the emissions of PM₁₀ and NO_x during construction and operation from earthmoving and equipment exhaust.

4.12 ETHNOHISTORY AND NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS

Project implementation would locate a landfill adjacent to traditional use sites of the Luiseno Tribe. The Luiseno Tribe are reluctant to discuss mitigation measures at this point. Mitigation measures have been identified by the consultant team and the applicant, including measures to increase access for the Pala Band of Mission Indians to Gregory Mountain. With the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts from dust and PM₁₀, and construction noise during the relocation of the SDG&E towers (approximately 10 years after the commencement of the landfill), all technical impacts including air quality, noise, and aesthetics would be at a level of less than significant. However, the Luiseño believe that impacts of the project on their “traditional use sites” would be significant. Their belief of significant impact is based on their intangible use and relationship to Gregory Mountain and Medicine Rock, which makes the use of conventional measurable performance standards to define level of impact significance difficult if not impossible. For this reason, this EIR concludes that from a subjective perspective, the impacts to Gregory Mountain and Medicine Rock would be significant and unmitigable.

4.13 AESTHETICS

The aesthetic impacts of the landfill face/slope and the landfill surface would remain significant for the landform quality impact category, even after the implementation of mitigation measures.

SUMMARY

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b), the information above summarizes the significant and unavoidable impacts that would occur with project implementation, even with the incorporation of mitigation measures identified in this EIR. Please see Chapter 10 of this Final EIR for the MMRP. Chapter 6 analyzes a reasonable range of alternatives, including on-site and off-site alternatives, and alternative methods to waste reduction. Two on-site prescriptive designs, one with a single liner and the other with a double liner, have been analyzed. While these alternatives do not reduce any of the significant and unavoidable impacts that would result from the project, the double liner would potentially provide greater protection of groundwater resources in the area than the proposed project. No other on-site alternative designs would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts to below a level of significance nor would such alternatives be environmentally superior to the proposed project. In addition, these alternatives would not achieve the project objectives. Please see Table 6-6 in this Final EIR.

CEQA permits the lead agency to determine that project impacts are significant and unmitigable and still to proceed with a project upon adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations. (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15091(a)(3); 15093). The Guidelines note that “if the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental affects, the adverse environmental affects may be considered acceptable”. (CEQA Guidelines § 15093(a). In this

case, DEH must determine whether the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental affects in determining whether to permit the project. The CIWMB, if the Board concurs on the permit, will make any necessary findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, if required by applicable law.

The No Project Alternative contained in Chapter 6 of this Final EIR presents data that shows the quantities and disposal pattern for solid waste in San Diego County as a whole and more specifically in North County. Based on data provided by the San Diego Department of Health in 2000 (refer to Appendix R), approximately 3,283,362 tons of Class III solid waste were generated within the County of San Diego in 1999. Of this, approximately 799,466 tons, or 24 percent, of solid waste were generated by jurisdictions in North County in 1999. In addition, Section 2K of Proposition C states: "The voters hereby reaffirm the policy of the County of San Diego that each sub-region of the County be responsible for providing sufficient solid waste facilities to handle the solid waste generated in each sub-region and solid waste shall not be shipped from one sub-region to any other sub-region except where an emergency exists."¹ While the North County subregion has several existing transfer stations (Fallbrook, Carlsbad, and Escondido), with the closure of the San Marcos Landfill there is no longer a landfill located in North County. Without the development of the project, solid waste from northern San Diego County would continue to be trucked to and disposed of at existing landfills in San Diego County, including Ramona (East County), Otay (South Bay), Miramar (City of San Diego) and Sycamore (East County/City of San Diego), as well as landfills located out-of-County, including Prima Deshecha (Orange County) and Copper Mountain (Arizona). The proposed project would centrally locate a solid waste facility within a region that currently does not have such infrastructure.

¹ While this language states a reaffirmation of a County policy, no existing, written policy has been found.